SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

15th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XV, Number 19 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | November 15, 1985

ISI Under Investigation

FBI Raid, Software Piracy Jar Science Tabloid Plan

An $18-million software piracy suit, a gangbusters-style FBI raid, and a federal grand jury investigation of allegations of interstate transportation of stolen property have descended upon the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) and its President and founder, Eugene Garfield, a pioneer and self-made millionaire in computerized retrieval and analysis of scientific literature.

The civil and criminal proceedings arise from charges that Garfield and ISI violated a software licensing agreement by copying a $48,000 typesetting program, Versacomp, purchased by ISI from Pagetec, Inc., a California firm. They are accused of transferring the program to Ralph Garner Associates, a New York typesetting firm run by Garfield's half-brother. ISI and Garner's firm have long maintained close business relations.

One of the side effects of these events is uncertainty about an altogether separate matter—advanced arrangements for an ISI partnership with the American subsidiary of the British weekly *The Economist* to publish an every-other-week tabloid for the scientific community. Titled *The Scientist,* and headquar-

(Continued on page 2)

Q&A, Part 2: Keyworth Blasts SDI Critics as "Demagogues"

The following concludes the interview that began in the last issue with White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II.

•

SGR. *How do you feel about the SDI boycott by some university researchers?*

Keyworth. I don't regard it as serious at all, because my understanding from a lot of academic sources is that it is not achieving wide and broadbased support. I think it began with some specific concerns about battle management and computer capabilities at the University of Illinois. It very rapidly became rather blatantly political. I know that a substantial number of people have signed it, but I don't think very many people whose own research opportunities or directions would in any way be affected by it.

SGR. *Robert Sproull [former President of Rochester University] recently expressed concern to [SDI Director] General Abrahamson about some of the leading institutions being the centers of the boycott—Cornell, Illinois, MIT. He said they're the ones SDI really needs (SGR Vol. XV, No. 17).*

Keyworth. There were stories some months ago that just because some researchers at MIT had taken some SDI funds, that was not to be treated as [indicating] institutional support for SDI. By the same token, some

(Continued on page 4)

In Brief

The American Association for the Advancement of Science advertised recently in the *New York Times* and *Washington Post* for a successor for Executive Officer William D. Carey, who's edging toward retirement after 10 years as the organization's top hired official. Names mentioned around AAAS corridors include Edward E. David Jr., a former AAAS President who recently stepped down as President of Exxon Research and Engineering, and Donald N. Langenberg, a AAAS Board member and Chancellor, University of Illinois, at Chicago. Carey says he's flexible about a departure date, but will probably be out by the May 1986 annual meeting.

As talk mounts of coming tough times for science budgets, pushers for the Superconducting Super Collider (SSC) are very touchy about price estimates for the proposed 60-miles-around accelerator. Last month Alvin Trivelpiece, Director of the Department of Energy's Office of Energy Research, testified on the SSC before the House Science and Technology Committee. The next day, SSC's public relations man, Wadsworthy Likely, phoned SGR to explain that Trivelpiece's mention of $10 billion should not be misunderstood. The price tag, Likely insisted, remains at the originally stated $4-6 billion.

White House Science Adviser George A. Keyworth II told SGR in a Q&A last issue that he spends "about 50 percent" of his time on the Strategic Defense Initiative. A staffer in his office says the correct figure is "at least 85 percent," and that SDI dominates Keyworth's agenda to the near-exclusion of anything else.

National Science Newspaper an Old Garfield Goal

The embryonic newspaper *The Scientist* is a product of an old yen by Eugene Garfield, founder and principal owner of the prosperous Institute for Scientific Information, and an interest in American publishing ventures on the part of the chiefs of Britain's distinguished news weekly, *The Economist.*

Garfield long ago was bitten by the rich man's bug for journalism. He's been talking about a national science newspaper for many years, and several years ago entered into a deal to explore the market in collaboration with *The Chronicle of Higher Education.* Following at least $250,000 worth of market tests and preliminary designs, the nascent partnership dissolved. The *Chronicle* concluded that a market didn't exist; Garfield remained convinced that it did. He said he had ample money to back a venture, but he often complained that he couldn't find a manager to operate it for him.

Meanwhile, the London-based *Economist,* independently owned and published by a permanent trust run by establishment figures, was looking away from the sagging British economy for investment opportunities abroad. Nicholas Valery, a Briton fresh from 3 years as the *Economist's* Tokyo correspondent, arrived in the US in 1983 to spend a year at Harvard as a Nieman Fellow. While there, he explored the possibility of the *Economist,* through its American subsidiary, Economist Newspaper Group, Inc., purchasing the MIT alumni magazine, *Technology Review,* which was regarded as an attractive and underexploited advertising medium.

The plan was to relaunch the *Review* as a magazine that universities around the country could buy, add their own local material, and sell to their alumni, as well as outsiders. *Tech Review* staff members, unsympathetic to being acquired, inflammed alumni opposition to these predatory plans, and the deal was off.

The *Economist's* attention then turned to exploration of founding a new magazine, tentatively titled *Innovate,* which would aim to give business and industry early warning of important scientific and technological developments. Following assemblage of a prototype and market tests, the London-based board killed the venture as too risky.

Discussions with Garfield about his newspaper dream soon followed, and led to the *Economist* ac-

(Continued on page 3)

. . . Seized Unauthorized Software in Raid, FBI Agent Says

(Continued from page 1)

tered in Washington, the long-planned publication is still scheduled to issue a prototype in late January and to go to a regular publication schedule in March.

But, according to Nicholas Valery, a veteran *Economist* correspondent who is the architect and manager of the new paper, the Board of the *Economist* has said, " 'Let's put this thing on hold until we have a clearer picture of what Garfield's problems are.' " Valery added that "if it looks like it will become an E. F. Hutton, we'll pull out"—a reference to the legal scandals currently surrounding the big Wall Street brokerage firm.

Garfield's office referred SGR's inquiries to Valery, who expressed the opinion that regardless of whether the *Economist* stuck with the newspaper venture, Garfield would go ahead with it. "Gene's been thinking about this for 25 years," Valery said.

FBI agents, bearing search warrants obtained following a tip by a former ISI employe, suddenly hit the ISI building in Philadelphia and Garner's firm in New York City on October 2. In the Philadelphia raid, they are reported to have ordered the main-entrance receptionist to remain silent while they sped to the data-processing department and rummaged for evidence.

FBI Supervisory Special Agent Joseph Gosseaux told SGR that the raiders found "a number" of unauthorized copies of Micropro's Wordstar programs on ISI premises, and an unauthorized copy of Pagetec's Versacomp in Garner's shop. At both locations, he said, the agents carried off the programs.

According to a report in the *Philadelphia Inquirer,* the raid followed a tip from Robert J. Campbell, Assistant Vice President of Data Processing at ISI from October 1984 to June 1985. The *Inquirer* reported that Campbell stated in an affidavit that ISI programmers devoted "several days" to breaking the security code designed to prevent use of Versacomp on systems not licensed by Pagetec.

The day after the raid, Pagetec filed suit against ISI, seeking damages for alleged violation of the licensing agreement. A hearing on a preliminary injunction calling for the return of the Pagetec software was scheduled in Federal District Court for November 13-14 (after press time for this issue of SGR.) Attorney Robert Branson, who is representing Garfield and ISI, told SGR that he thinks the case "can be settled in 2 to 4 weeks." But lawyers familiar with such proceedings said that such speed would be unusual.

Meanwhile, the case has been referred to a federal grand jury. FBI Agent Gosseaux told SGR that the grand jury is looking into charges of interstate transportation of stolen property, copyright violation, "and possibly mail fraud." All are felonies and can carry penalties of fines and imprisonment.—DSG

. . . AAAS Magazine's Market Targeted by New Paper

(Continued from page 2)

cepting Valery's proposal for a study of editorial formula, circulation and advertising potential. With $78,000 from ISI and $68,000 from the *Economist,* the explorations were conducted from March through August of this year. The conclusion was that a good market existed for an upscale, smartly produced every-other-week newspaper confined to news and commentary about the politics and economics of science; it would not get involved with substantive scientific matters.

Particular attention was focused on the market for classified scientific recruiting advertising. Estimated by Valery at $20 million a year nationwide, these ads gravitate to a variety of major newspapers and professional publications, with about half the dollar volume shared by the *New York Times, Boston Globe, Washington Post, Chicago Sun Times, Los Angeles Times,* and the *San Francisco Chronicle.* Most of the balance goes to *Science, Chemical & Engineering News,* and *Physics Today.*

Valery concluded that the dispersal reflected the American market's lack of a single outstanding medium for recruiting ads, such as Britain's *New Scientist,* which dominates scientific recruiting ads in the UK. It was further concluded that with only a small slice of the total classified volume, a new scientific newspaper would be economically viable.

On the question of whose exisiting share would be targeted, Valery told SGR, "If there's any competition for ads and reading time, it's *Science,"* the weekly of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The perception of market share waiting to be taken arises from the widely held view that *Science* went into the doldrums during the overly long reign of its previous editor, Philip Abelson, and that it doesn't appear to be editorially improving under his successor, parttime editor Daniel Koshland Jr. In terms of competitiveness on the business front, the magazine does not display a tigerish spirit.

For startup circulation, the new newspaper would take a one-year piggyback on 27,000 "upscale" readers culled from the subscribers to the ISI series of *Current Contents* publications. At the end of the year, they'd be invited to become paid up subscribers. At the same time, a nationwide mail campaign would be conducted to attract additional subscribers. The aims were modest—just 46,000 readers by the end of the 4th year. But the marketing strategy called for them to be very desirable readers in terms of income and professional status. At the *Economist,* the venture was seen as a testing ground for possibly starting other specialized publications aimed at professional groups in the US.

On September 24, just a week before the FBI barged into Garfield's building, the ISI board formally approved plans to enter into a partnership with the *Economist* for publication of Garfield's long-dreamed-of paper—for which the name *The Scientist* had finally been settled on. By coincidence, the *Economist's* board met in London on that same date and approved the deal.

It called for a startup fund of $3 million to be available over 5 years, with ISI putting up 60 percent, the *Economist* 40 percent. Garfield would be President of the partnership, and Valery would be General Manager. The FBI struck while the collaboration was held together by a letter of intent, pending signing of a partnership contract—which remains unsigned while the *Economist* waits for the legal dust to settle.

In expectation of approval, office space was rented in downtown Washington, and the first staff hirings were made: Tabitha Powledge, an experienced science writer, who will be Editor-in-Chief, and Michael Baer, a specialist in classified advertising, who will be Advertising Director.

Valery says that, pending resolution of ISI's legal difficulties, he has been instructed by London to stay with the project but not to spend any more *Economist* money on it. ISI funds continue to be available for startup preparations, he said, and the newspaper project is proceeding with plans for a prototype issue at the end of January and biweekly publication starting in March.

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1985

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Contributing Correspondents
Francois Seguier (Paris); Ros Herman (London)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.,* twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, $185.00 (two years, $325.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

. . . Keyworth: SDI Opponents Politically Motivated

(Continued from page 1)
faculty at MIT expressing their political views on our Administration's objectives, SDI in particular, doesn't represent an institutional response, either. I would most certainly worry if I saw many dozens of the leading technical institutions of the country expressing unwillingness to pursue a major, if not the major, thrust in national security. I don't see that happening at all.

I see pockets of people with clearly political motivations. I use the word *political* as contrasted to genuine, profound motivations about nuclear stability, nuclear war, an enduring peace. I think these [expressions of opposition] are much more demagoguery than they are a profound understanding of the problems we confront. And I think they are from a relatively small number of people. I don't see momentum being built up, and in that sense, I'm not concerned. I see a lot more momentum being built up within groups of people who are taking the time and trouble to understand the real issues, and who are expressing everything from increasing curiosity to genuine wanting to come on board.

"Blatant Political Views"

SGR. *The Cornell and Illinois statements against SDI covered a broad spectrum of concerns, from destabilization of deterrence to the technical feasibility of SDI. Do you view those concerns as political in nature?*

Keyworth. I think when these purportedly technical concerns have been expressed, such as 10 million lines of computer code being an unachievable requirement of battle-management system, as well as a host of other technical issues, I think they are a clear and obvious cosmetic facade for what are blatant political views underneath. In fact, I would argue that the scientific community's assessment of SDI and its implications for stability has been markedly devoid of technological basis and remarkably filled with demagoguery and politics. I would say remarkably—more so than the debate that preceded our national commitment to developing the hydrogen bomb.

SGR. *What would be an example of demagoguery. Many people have been debating it on the merits, whether political or technical.*

Keyworth. Name one.

SGR. *[Richard] Garwin [of IBM, a longtime government defense consultant and frequent commentator on arms-control issues], for example. He's widely regarded as an informed and accomplished analyst of defense matters.*

Keyworth. I'm going to say no comment, because in the first place, I don't believe you've suddenly turned into a naive observer.

SGR. *Do you think that anyone who has raised questions about SDI has done it purely on the merits—no politics, as you call it, or demagoguery.*

Keyworth. Sure. Michael Howard, in the UK, a distinguished defense strategist, has some genuine concerns, and they're been brought out to the betterment of the overall scientific and technical debate. I think a lot of people have raised genuine concerns. In the present discussions we're having about Geneva and arms-control prospects, some intelligent perspectives have come out.

What I am particularly talking about is the position that the scientific community has taken publicly, in particular the Union of Concerned Scientists, which I do not think reflects well upon the objectivity of the scientific profession. Were it not for the fact that our public has seen this in the past, I think it would seriously—and perhaps has, to some extent—injure the credibility of the scientific profession. I do not think that our community has presented in the media a clear, objective set of criticisms of either the technical feasibility, the implications for stability, or even the real meaning of SDI.

Let me give you an example: The scientific community in no small measure has addressed the concept of a "perfect defense"—a concept that was never proposed, discussed, taken seriously, or whatever, by this Administration. Nor has it ever been stressed as a requirement.

No Promise of Perfect Defense

SGR. *The President's original speech, with its references to making nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," and destroying missiles before they reach their target, at least allowed for the interpretation of a perfect defense.*

Keyworth. I beg to differ. I was involved in the development of that speech. And [that interpretation is] completely and inalterably false. If you go back and read it, you will find that is the case. What it says is that our objective is to make missiles and ultimately nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete." And I would say that the interpretation which you are representing, that that implies perfect defense, is fatuous and ignorant, no less. I would argue that if you have a ballistic missile defense which is simply sufficiently effective that the Soviet planner can no longer be confident of carrying out his military missions, then I would say that those missiles carrying nuclear weapons have been made impotent and obsolete, as they have lost their military potential for the Soviet Union.

And I would argue that a Soviet strategist or planner would therefore place his emphasis in his strategic force

(Continued on page 5)

Tales from Grantland: NAS Gets Western Outpost

Headquartered in Washington, DC, for all of its 122 years, the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) needs a West Coast conference center like it needs shrinkage in the federal overhead rate on which it subsists.

But strong-willed philanthropists are notorious for giving the gifts that please them, particularly inscribable buildings, rather than the no-strings cash so earnestly desired in grantland. And that explains why—though the official account differs—the high-living but impecunious National Academy of Sciences and its wholly owned subsidiary, the National Academy of Engineering, are on the way to becoming joint landlords of California property: a $20-million, 50,000-square-foot conference building, to be known as the Arnold and Mabel Beckman Center, on a 7-acre site, valued at $6-million, in faraway Irvine, California. Heretofore, the Academy's only outpost has been a summertime boondoggle dascha at Woods Hole, Mass.

Fortunately for the Academy, the money is segmented in accord with one of the ancient precepts of non-profit economics: Don't take gifts that eat. Of the $20 million, $10.7 million will be set aside in an endowment to stoke the West Coast white elephant. The site, adjacent to the UC Irvine campus, was donated by the Irvine Company, which is developing an R&D community on a surrounding 415 acres.

The lead benefactor in this affair is Arnold O. Beckman, 85, the renowned inventor-industrialist of scientific instruments, who several years ago set off a

(Continued on page 6)

Keyworth

(Continued from page 4)

structure on other elements, whether they be cruise missiles or aircraft, or whatever, or submarines. Incidentally, go look in a dictionary at the words "impotence" and "obsolete," and ask me if they are consistent with what I've just described or whether they are consistent with the requirements for a perfect defense.

SGR. *You picked from abroad for the sole critic of SDI that you consider legitimate. Are there any domestic critics that deserve to be taken seriously?*

Keyworth. Sure. I think there are a number of legitimate questions that have come up from a host of people, such as Herb York [physicist and UC San Diego professor who served in numerous senior defense research posts], who have had a background in both science and national security. Of course, there are people, but if you ask yourself what do the American people see as the position and role of the American scientific community, I think they see 2 things: Either they see the action that has occurred in the increasing maturity of the SDI program—obviously, there's research that's going on that's making us and the President increasingly confident in it; that's one thing that they see. But, on the other hand, they are seeing shrill debate that comes from the Union of Concerned Scientists, as well as a number of individuals who have devoted themselves to attacking SDI. And I would argue that the latter are not symbolic of an objective scientific debate.

It doesn't matter if I give you a dozen names of people who have been thoroughly responsible critics. They're invisible. Look at the correlation between the people who led the Scientists and Engineers for Mondale [a last-minute, letterhead group that included Linus Pauling, Sidney Drell, and Murray Gell-Mann—SGR Vol. XIV, No. 18] last year and the opposition to SDI. The 2 are so completely intertwined that I'd have grave doubts whether many of those gentlemen would even have gone out on the political trail, had it not been for their monomaniacal dedication to attacking SDI and the change it encompassed.

SGR. *What do you regard as their motivation? After all, these are patriotic, knowledgeable people.*

Keyworth. Of course, they are. But let's go back and look at another example. Look at the debate that preceded the hydrogen bomb. You saw a lot of deep concern, some coming from awareness of the change that the nuclear age represented. Everybody had deep concerns about the ethical and moral implications. And the question was what to do about it. Now, remember the polarization in the scientific community. They were almost universally against the development of the hydrogen bomb. And remember that just 6 months after we detonated our hydrogen bomb, the Soviets detonated one that was considerably more sophisticated.

Therefore, I would say that the analogy here is somewhat similar. We're not talking about whether people are patriotic. We're talking about whether people are realistic and whether people are informed of and aware of the implications of the overall decision that they're associated with. We're also addressing something else, and that is whether scientists are any more objective than any other group of people. And I think the answer is pretty obvious that they are not.

SGR. *Then do you see the SDI opponents as naive about political and military realities?*

Keyworth. I would say that a lot of politically based criticism from within the scientific community comes from naivete, but I would say that even more so, from idealism about how the world should be, rather than how the world really is.

. . . "A Marriage of Need and Vision," Press Claims

(Continued from page 5)

frenzy in academe and environs when he announced plans to preside personally over the disbursement of his fortune, estimated to be at least $200 million.

A member of the National Academy of Engineering, Beckman met about 2 years ago with NAS President Frank Press to discuss an award to the Academy complex. NAS subsequently put together a proposal soliciting about $10 million to support ongoing activities of the academies, as well as funds for the program of internally supported public-policy studies that Press has been emphasizing to complement the organization's mainstay diet of federally initiated and financed studies. At the Academy, there were no thoughts whatever of a remote conference center, SGR is reliably advised.

But Beckman, who made his fortune as founder and chairman of Beckman Instruments, in Fullerton, California, had strong feelings stemming from his ties to California and his belief that the scientifically powerful West Coast was neglected in national science-policy affairs. The Academy's proposal for some $10 million for its general revenues made it to a "short list," but then got scrubbed by Beckman himself in favor of the conference center idea. When he told NAS President Press and his engineering counterpart, NAE President Robert White, that he would provide $20 million for a conference center in Irvine, but nothing else, they promptly saw virtue in a conference center in Irvine.

Scurrying for a rationale for this peculiar acquisition, Press told a news conference on November 4 that the Beckman Center is "a happy marriage of need and vision." He added that the center will improve "access to Academy activities for the science, engineering, and medical communities in the western United States and for colleagues from Japan and other important US trading partners bordering the Pacific." Not mentioned was that it will commensurately reduce access of eastern participants.

At the press conference, White said that "A national institution must conduct its work on a truly national scale," adding that the Beckman gift "has moved the Academies much closer to this truly national perspective."

Beckman himself said the Center would "enable the Academies to perform their functions more efficiently and at a lower cost than operating solely out of their Washington, DC, headquarters." He also expressed concern "over the haphazard manner in which many ethical issues related to science, technology, and society are handled." Referring to "ethical problems" involving genetic engineering, Beckman said:

"Currently such matters are aired in the media largely by activists who see only a narrow aspect of a problem. Through simplistic sloganeering and mass demonstrations, they seek to establish policies that should be established only after thorough, thoughtful study and discussion by competent leaders in whatever professions may be involved, including social sciences, economics, religion, and politics as well as medical and physical sciences and engineering."

The Beckman gift was described as the largest single offering ever received by the NAS or the NAE. It is also distinctive in another respect: though the Academy of Engineering, founded in 1964, is legally only an administrative appendage to the Congressionally chartered,

(Continued on page 7)

NAS Journal Gets Transfusion

Continuing a slow recuperation from congenital rigor mortis, *Issues,* the year-old quarterly of the National Academy of Sciences, is the beneficiary of a $170,000 windfall for providing 20,000 1-year free subscriptions for the kind of blue-chip readers that the journal hasn't heavily drawn as cash customers. The freebies figure large in *Issues'* circulation, since the paid-up list, now in the uncertainties of the annual renewal cycle, numbers only 12,000-15,000, according to Allen L. Hammond, the editor.

The $170,000 was provided by the Weingart Foundation, of Los Angeles, which normally confines itself to Southern California causes. But, having contributed to the founding of the journal, it responded to pleas for promotional help.

Apart from a few sycophantic raves, *Issues'* debut number was widely rated as a drowsy product, some of it recycled, ghost-written stuff by senior circuit riders in science-policy affairs. But the publication has progressively improved, and its recent numbers have included some meritorious articles. In terms of influence, it remains far short of NAS President Frank Press's goal of a science-policy counterpart to *Foreign Affairs,* but in terms of editorial quality and interest, it is no longer an embarrassment to the Academy.

The 20,000 Weingart subscribers—public officials, university administrators, industrial captains—will be asked to pay up if they want to continue receiving the magazine following 4 complimentary issues. The word around the Academy is that if the paid subscriber rolls don't expand substantially within a year or two, the publication will be axed.

NSF Head Urges R&D Fund Shift to Basic Science

With Gramm-Rudman anti-deficit fever raging in Washington, attention is shifitng from old-style program growth through budget growth to getting a slice of someone else's budget. Such talk is customarily discreet and veiled as to the specific targets, as can be seen in the excerpts from an address by NSF Director Erich Bloch to the American Council on Education, October 30, in Miami Beach.

•

The next 3 years will be difficult budget years. We must look at the entire $53-billion federal R&D budget to find any money for new initiatives or for added emphasis in existing areas, if we want to better basic research and infrastructure support. Incremental dollars won't be available.

The case for reallocation is compelling. For most of the postwar period, the primary rationale for federal support of research has been the support of specific government missions. In the early years following the war, this meant that most research support in the physical sciences came from the Department of Defense and the Atomic Energy Commission. In more recent years, other agencies have been involved.

The trouble with a system that relies primarily on the mission agencies for support is that it introduces a systematic bias against basic research. Except for the Sputnik era in the 1960s, the federal government has not done a very good job of supporting the overall science and engineering base—the researchers, equipment and facilities in universities and colleges that we depend on for education and basic research.

In the last 4 years, the federal government has started to renew its commitment to the science and engineering base. In the civilian part of the federal R&D budget, development has dropped from the largest part of the R&D effort to the smallest, and basic research has risen to become the largest component . . .

On the defense side, however, basic research is a small part of the effort. And since defense is an increasingly large part of the federal R&D effort, the overall effect in the last year or 2 has actually been a reduction in the proportion of the federal R&D dollar that goes to basic research.

We need to go much further than we have so far in reallocating R&D resources from development to support the science and engineering base. The easiest way, of course, would be simply to add funds to the total. But that is not realistic in today's budget climate.

What is necessary is that we recognize that the federal government can do some things well, and that support of the science and engineering base is one of them. And it does some other things not well at all—including making decisions about technologies that should be developed for commercial reasons.

If we are sufficiently tough-minded about cutting out the latter—still a significant fraction of the budget—then we should have available the resources to substantially increase the support of basic research and the science and engineering base.

Academy *(Continued from page 6)*

ancient Academy of Sciences, Beckman divided the $20 million between them. The 2 Academies have been getting along well under the Press-White presidencies, but under previous regimes, the engineers openly talked of going their own way.

In addition to the NAS-NAE award, Beckman has given $40 million to his alma mater, the University of Illinois, for centers for computer sciences and cognitive studies, and $12 million to the Stanford School of Medicine, toward construction of a Center for Genetic and Molecular Medicine, plus other gifts.

Academy sources say that a small conference-running staff will be stationed at the new center, which is expected to open in about 2 years. They said there are no plans afoot to base any programs there, or to relocate from Washington any of the permanent secretariats that keep things running for the working arm of the NAS complex, the National Research Council.

The announcement of Beckman's munificence was not accompanied by any discussion of the currently sensitive issue of optimal use of resources in a period of tightening support for scientific endeavors. Academy President Press has been a leader in the fight against Congressional influence over the distribution of federal construction funds, publicly insisting on several occasions that scarce public resources should be allocated through peer review rather than individual caprice.—DSG

To Order or Renew A Subscription

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $185.00 ☐; two years, $325.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $25.00 per year additional.)

Name _____

Address _____

_____ Zip _____

New Arthritis Institute Makes the Grade at NIH

An NIH authorization bill carrying a provision to create an Institute for Arthritis, Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases was vetoed last week by President Reagan on grounds that it also allowed too much Congressional meddling in NIH managerial affairs. The House promptly overrode the veto, and, at this writing, the bill was back in the Senate, where an override also seemed likely.

But whatever the legislative outcome, the long-sought lobbying goal of a separate arthritis institute has been accomplished. In an effort to derail the bill, the White House said it would employ administrative authority to create the institute—which means it's now bound to happen, one way or another.

In any event, while there's a lot of rhetorical thumping about political aggression against NIH's prerogatives, the bill actually falls far short of the devastating effects prophesied by NIH's skittish managers and their hovering friends in the Association of American Medical Colleges.

Among other things, it directs NIH to set up a formal system for reviewing spending on its inhouse research, establish a bioethics board, pay more attention to disease prevention, and create a National Center for Nursing Research. A previous proposal had called for establishment of a full-fledged NIH Institute for Nursing Research, but NIH management balked on the grounds that it doesn't want more institutes of any kind, let alone one that smacks of health-service delivery. It doesn't want that Arthritis Institute, either, since its creation will hearten other disease lobbies to seek their own headquarters on the Bethesda campus. But the arthritis lobby is big and powerful on Capitol Hill and, after years of agitation, can no longer be resisted.

The Reagan veto message charged that the bill "manifests an effort to exert undue political control over decisions regarding scientific research while thus limiting the ability of the NIH to set this nation's biomedical research agenda . . . . "

The bill's principal sponsor, Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.), Chairman of the Subcommitee on Health and the Environment, responded that Reagan "has done everything possible to cripple one of this nation's proudest accomplishments, its world leadership in biomedical research."

With some allowance for political hyperbole, both Reagan and Waxman are correct. The bill would permit Congress to intrude on NIH's agenda-making authority, and it is true that Reagan has tried, unsuccessfully, to cut the budgetary guts out of NIH.

The veto, coming 2 years after Reagan's veto of a similar bill, is the latest episode in a long-running conflict involving Waxman's effort to get a tighter grip on NIH affairs and Bethesda's squirming to stay out of his clutches while eluding White House designs for closer management of biomedical research.

As has been the case for decades, the main political power over NIH remains concentrated in the House and Senate Appropriations Subcommittees for NIH, which again this year performed faithfully. With NIH receiving an appropriation of $5.148 billion in fiscal 1985, Reagan sought only $4.860 billion for the current fiscal year, 1986. The House Subcommittee voted for $5.247 billion, while the Senate Subcommittee went beyond that, voting for $5.406.

NAS Sets Up New Math Board

Establishment of an 18-member Board on Mathematical Sciences Education has been announced by the National Academy of Sciences. The Chairman is Shirley A. Hill, Professor of Mathematics and Education, University of Missouri-Kansas City. The Board will conduct studies on various subjects, including testing, standards, and teacher education.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

XEROX-UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106